

REMARKS

The Examiner has required a restriction as set forth on pages 3-5 of the Office Action. While the Examiner has set forth 5 different proposed groups of claims, Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is improper for at least the following reasons.

First of all, as suggested by at least Groups I-III as identified on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has attempted to breakup Applicants' generic claims. While the Examiner is permitted in a restriction requirement to restrict between groups of claims, 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372 do not permit the Examiner to divide up within Applicants' generic claims.

Secondly, the Examiner has not identified a definite grouping of claims, but instead has improperly shifted the burden to the Applicants to identify a "single invention" to be examined. Nothing in the statute or the rules permits this kind of action by the Examiner.

Nevertheless, in an attempt to advance prosecution, Applicants have added new claims 36-37 and state that claim 36 would be an acceptable scope of generic claim for examination in this application. Applicants believe that the definition of substituent groups R1-R5 in claim 36 represent a scope which clearly would not place any undue burden on the Examiner and more than properly define a single invention for examination in a single application.

Examination on the merits is, therefore, requested.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$120.00 is attached hereto.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Leonard R. Svensson Reg. No. 30,330 at the

Application No. 10/560,924
Amendment dated April 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 11, 2008

Docket No.: 4614-0185PUS1

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Leonard R. Svensson
Registration No.: 30,330
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
12770 High Bluff Drive
Suite 260
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 792-8855
Attorney for Applicant